



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/010,961	12/06/2001	Chien-Min Sung	20236	5672

20551 7590 09/15/2005

THORPE NORTH & WESTERN, LLP.
8180 SOUTH 700 EAST, SUITE 200
P.O. BOX 1219
SANDY, UT 84070

EXAMINER

ROSE, ROBERT A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3723

DATE MAILED: 09/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Patent and Trademark Office**Address: **COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS**
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------	-------------	-----------------------	---------------------

10/010961

12/6/01

SUNG

EXAMINER

ROSE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3723

091405

DATE MAILED:

EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY RECORD

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) EXR. R. ROSE (3) MR. ERIC ERICKSEN(2) MR DAVID OSBORNE (4) _____Date of interview 09/14/05Type: ☐ Telephonic ☒ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description: _____Agreement ☐ was reached with respect to some or all of the claims in question. ☒ was not reached.Claims discussed: ALL OF RECORDIdentification of prior art discussed: ALL OF RECORDDescription of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: APPLICANTS ATTORNEYS

STRESSED THAT THE CITED ART WAS DIRECTED TO DRESSING TOOLS FOR NON-FIXED
ABRASIVE PADS, WHILE APPLICANTS DEVICE IS DIRECTED TO A DRESSER FOR FIXED
ABRASIVE PADS. EXAMINER POINTED OUT THAT THE CLAIMS DID NOT STRUCTURALLY
DISTINGUISH OVER THE CITED ART, AND SUGGESTED THAT A METHOD OF USE WOULD

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

PROBABLY OVERCOME THE CITED ART. EXR ALSO INTRODUCED US 682189 AS INDICATIVE

☐ 1. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.
OF STRUCTURED ABRASIVE TOOLS OF SIMILAR STRUCTURE TO APPLICANTS DEVICE.
Unless the paragraph below has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW (e.g., items 1-7 on the reverse side of this form). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, then applicant is given one month from this interview date to provide a statement of the substance of the interview.

☐ 2. Since the examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the substance of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner's Signature